



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,079	11/16/2001	Valery Tsourikov	IMC-43	4738

7590

01/30/2006

TOBY H KUSMERE  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,079

Applicant(s)

TSOURIKOV ET AL.

Examiner

Lamont M. Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments, p.6. "Yet the present invention is directed toward a semantic query system. Lamberti teaches a paraphrasing the natural language expression into a "goal-expression, yet the present claims do not teach this. For example, the syntactic system of Lamberti does not include the query elements A-O, S-A, S-X-O, or element S of, for example, independent claims 1 or 12." The Examiner cannot concur, that Lamberti does not include the query elements.... Furthermore, as broadly claimed by applicant, even a "goal-expression" may read on the claims in the present state. Furthermore, the Examiner fails to locate a semantic limitation in the claims, which distinguishes a semantic from syntactical analysis. In addition, Lamberti includes at least a query element, A-O, S-A, S-X-O, or S, (see C.6.liens 29-56, for example C.6.lines 29, 30, "What can I erase", erase as the verb element, I as the subject element, in the query.

The arguments regarding the dependent claims are also not persuasive as related to the explanations above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2654

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 8 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamberti et al. (5,377,103).

As per **claim 1**, Lamberti et al teach a system enabling a user to ask a question (query) and for providing the user with one or more answers or solutions to such question, the system comprising:

" user apparatus for generating first signals representative of a natural language user query that includes at least a query elements (A-O), (S-A) or (S-X-O) or element (s)" (Lamberti; figures 1-2, col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 14; and col. 4, lines 63, C.6.lines 29-56, for example C.6.lines 29, 30, "What can I erase", erase as the verb element, I as the subject element, in the query)

"storing a knowledge base of a plurality of S-A-O's and for identifying at least one knowledge base element S, A, O, or element (A-O) associated with a respective knowledge base S-A-O that includes the query elements or elements in response to the first signals, and generating second signals representatives of the natural language answer S-A-O that includes the identified element or elements and the query elements or elements" (figure 1, his knowledge base 24; figure 2, his knowledge base 38, col. 4, lines 53-58, col. 5, lines 28-59);

"the user apparatus generating a natural language visual display to the user of the natural language answers S-A-O in response to receiving the second signals" (col. 6, lines 5-10).

It is noted that Lamberti et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach a server for storing a knowledge base and means for transmitting the first signals for the user apparatus to the server and for transmitting the second signals from the server to the user apparatus". Lamberti's system appears to retrieve a data stored locally in the computer's knowledge base(Lamberti; col\_. 4, lines 3537). However, the use of a server for storing a knowledge base and the use of communications from the user (client) to the server are well known in the art. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time then invention was made would have it obvious to store the knowledge base in a server because it would facilitate many user to retrieve information that is of interest to them and therefore expand the system's capability.

As per **claim 2**, it is further noted that Lamberti et al does not explicitly teach wherein said server conducts a search of the World Wide Web. However, the use of communication devices for searching for publications on the Internet and World Wide Web are old and well known in the art as admitted by Applicant in the Background of the invention. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate a communication device within Lamberti's computer for accessing the Internet with the motivation of providing user access to the numerous fundamental technical publications thereby expanding the system's capability to retrieve that information which is important to the user.

As per **claim 3**, Lamberti et al teach wherein said server conducts said search automatically in response to server...to user search command (col. 5, lines 50-64).

As per **claim 4**, Lamberti et al teach wherein said server is programmed to query the user...user search command (col. 6, lines 4-26).

As per **claim 8**, Lamberti et al teach wherein said user apparatus includes a user digital computer for generating said first signals and receiving said second signals "(figure 1).

As per **claim 11**, Lamberti et al teach wherein said second signals represent each\_ answer S-A-O in sentence format (col. 6, lines 40 to col. 7, line 67).

3. Claims 5-7, 9-10 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamberti et al (5,377,103) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Johnson (5,748,974).

As per **claim 5**, Lamberti et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein user apparatus converts human voice signals into said first signals. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Johnson who teach a multimodal natural language interface that enables users to combine natural language (spoken, typed or handwritten) using a speech recognizer to convert the speech signal into text at the abstract and figure 2 (his speech input). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Lamberti' s system a speech recognizer because it allow expand the capability of the system by allowing user to enter their input speaking it that would facilitate users who cannot type.

As per **claims 6-7 and 9-10**, Johnson teaches wherein user apparatus converts second signals into audio signals (his output response generator 54).

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms  
01/20/06



**RICHEMOND DORVIL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**